

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached one replacement sheet of formal drawings includes changes to Figures 1 through 3. The attached replacement sheet of drawings replaces the previously presented sheet including Figures 1 through 3. The replacement sheet includes Figures 1 through 3 as amended.

**Attachment:**

One formal replacement sheet.

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant has amended claims 11, 14, 15, and 23. Applicant has cancelled claim 17 from the application without prejudice. Claims 11 through 16 and 18 through 23 remain in the application. Applicant has amended the specification. Applicant has amended the drawings.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.121(d). Applicant has amended the drawings to include the legend "prior art". Attached is one replacement sheet showing the addition of the legend "prior art" into the Figures. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings, as amended, overcome the objection under 37 CFR 1.121(d) and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

Applicant has amended the specification to reflect that parent application serial number 10/255,910 has since issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,736,181.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 15 and 23 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 23, as amended, overcome the rejection under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph, and are allowable over this rejection.

Claims 11 through 13, 15 through 16 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Jessup, et al, U.S. 5,938,875. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

U.S. Patent No. 5,938,875 to Jessup, et al discloses a structural bonding process with encapsulated foaming adhesive.

In contradistinction, claim 11, as amended, claims a method of reticulating a film adhesive onto a perforated panel including the steps of supporting the panel, adhering the film

adhesive to the perforated panel without initiating a cure of the film adhesive, applying a vacuum to the film adhesive and softening of the film adhesive. It also includes the steps of moving the perforated panel at a predetermined speed through a reticulation unit, drying an airflow and removing the film adhesive from the perforations by the airflow.

U.S. Patent 5,938,875 to Jessup, et al., does not disclose, teach, suggest or contemplate Applicant's invention as claimed in amended claim 11. In particular, the Jessup, et al., reference does not disclose a method of reticulating a film adhesive onto a perforated panel that includes the steps of drying an airflow and then removing the film adhesive from the perforations by the airflow. Nowhere does Jessup, et al., '875 disclose, teach, suggest or contemplate the use of drying an airflow for use in removing film adhesive from the perforations of a perforated panel. As the '875 reference does not disclose, teach or contemplate such a limitation, the '875 reference cannot be used as a §102 reference against Applicant's claim 11, as amended. Therefore, Jessup, et al., '875 fails to disclose all of the limitations claimed by Applicant in amended claim 11. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, overcome the rejection under 35 USC §102(b) and are allowable over this rejection.

Claims 11 through 13, 15 through 16 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jessup in view of Bourlier, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,500,516. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

U.S. Patent No. 6,500,516 to Bourlier, et al., discloses light transmitting panels.

In contradistinction, claim 11, as amended, claims a method of reticulating a film adhesive onto a perforated panel including the steps of supporting the panel, adhering the film adhesive to the perforated panel without initiating a cure of the film adhesive, applying a vacuum

to the film adhesive and softening of the film adhesive. It also includes the steps of moving the perforated panel at a predetermined speed through a reticulation unit, drying an airflow and removing the film adhesive from the perforations by the airflow.

The Jessup, '875 reference alone or in combination with the Bourlier '516 reference does not disclose, suggest, teach or contemplate Applicant's invention as claimed in amended claim 11. In particular, neither reference discloses, teaches, suggests, or contemplates a methodology including a step of drying an airflow and then removing a film adhesive from the perforations of a perforated panel by the dried airflow. Nowhere in either reference is it contemplated, suggested, taught or even mentioned to dry an airflow to be used to remove a film adhesive from the perforations of a panel. Hence, as it is not disclosed, taught, suggested or even mentioned in any of the prior art to dry the airflow, it is not proper for the Examiner to state that it would be obvious to dry the air without any specific teaching, suggestion, contemplation or disclosure in any of the prior art for such drying. It is improper for the Examiner to infer a limitation into a combination of the references where there is no such disclosure, teaching or suggestion for such limitation in any of the references cited by the Examiner. The failure of any of the references to teach such a drying of an airflow wherein that airflow is used to remove an adhesive in and of itself proves that such limitation is not obvious. If this limitation was such an obvious limitation, it would have been mentioned in at least one of the prior art references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, unless the Examiner can cite a specific teaching, disclosure or suggestion of drying an airflow, such a limitation cannot be inferred as being obvious in the art. Therefore, as no specific example teaching or suggestion is mentioned in any of the prior art cited by the Examiner, any combination of any of the references cited by the Examiner cannot be used to create the methodology as claimed by Applicant in amended claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully

submitted that claim 11, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, overcome the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) and are allowable over this rejection.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jessup, et al., or alternatively, Jessup in view of Bourlier as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Wilson, U.S. Patent No. 4,155,800. Claims 17, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jessup, or alternatively Jessup in view of Bourlier as applied to claim 11 above. Claims 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jessup, or alternatively Jessup in view of Bourlier as applied to claim 11 above and further in view of Trnka, U.S. Patent No. 4,990,201 and/or Wilson. Claims 11 through 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Jessup. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson and Jessup as applied to claim 11 above and further in view of Trnka. Claims 11 through 22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trnka in view of Jessup and Wilson. Claims 11 through 22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Trnka in view of Bourlier and further in view of Jessup and Wilson. It is respectfully submitted that claim 11, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable for the same reasons given above for amended claim 11 with respect to the §103 rejection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, overcome these rejections under 35 USC §103(a) and are allowable over these rejections.

If the Applicant may be of any further assistance or provide any other information in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (248) 364-2100.

Respectfully submitted,

RAGGIO & DINNIN, P.C.

By: 

Michael T. Raggio (Reg. No. 36,645)  
2701 Cambridge Court, Ste. 410  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326  
(248) 364-2100

*Attorney for Applicant*

Dated: March 10, 2006